

United States District Court for the _____

District of Maryland

File Number 8:17-2341-PJM

Linda Gough

v.) Notice of Appeal
Bankers Life and Casualty Company)

Notice is hereby given that Linda Gough (plaintiffs) (defendants) in the above named case,* hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (from the final judgment) (from the order (describing it)) entered in this action on the 22 day of February, 20 19.

(s) Linda Gough

2/28/2019

Attorney for pro se

Address: 6900 Wisconsin Ave. #30497

Bethesda, MD 20824

[*Note to inmate filers: If you are an inmate confined in an institution and you seek the timing benefit of Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1), complete the Declaration of Inmate Filing and file that declaration along with this Notice of Appeal]*

* See Rule 3(c) for permissible ways of identifying appellants.



RE: Linda Gough v. Bankers Life
Case No: 8:17-cv-02341-PJM

My issues on appeal are: (required):

- 1) The judge made an error in granting Bankers Life Motion to Dismiss.
- 2) I believe the pro bono appointed to me was biased and I suffered religious discrimination that influenced the outcome of the case, as I had to proceed pro se.

1. I think the judge made an error in granting Bankers Life Motion to Dismiss. I believe the District Court should have considered the new allegations that I brought in my Amended Complaint, Opposition, and Surreply. I did not have access to assets during my time at Bankers Life. I was under the supervision of a Unit Supervisor who did not show up for work and did not include me in sales to support a living wage or make a salary respective of my background. It is necessary that the Court determines whether the "outside sales" FLSA exemption applies to my case.

2. The first pro bono attorney, Cori Cohen from the Law Office of Gary M. Gilbert and Associates, accepted the case to undertake a five-hour investigation and prepare a report (Docket 11). Ms. Cohen wrote the Report on Viability of Plaintiff's Claims.

Judge Messitte appointed the second pro bono attorney, Anessa Abrams from Ford Harrison LLP. It is my understanding she did not accept the case. I never spoke to her and saw on the Docket that she terminated 4/19/18.

The third and final pro bono attorney was Brian Markovitz of Joseph Greenwald and Laake PA.

I believe that the final pro bono attorney, Brian Markovitz, was biased as I suffered religious discrimination that influenced the outcome of the case, as I had to proceed pro se. Judge Messitte terminated him and I was informed by letter to proceed pro se.

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months?

Yes, I hope this issue with employment discrimination is addressed and that I may move forward with finding work in my field.